PLAINTIFF'SI COMPLAINT

4

6

11

10

12 13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

2122

23

24

25

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- 3. Jurisdiction of this Court over Counts I of Plaintiff's Complaint arises pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331, and 28 U.S.C. § 1367 grants this court supplemental jurisdiction over the state claims contained herein.
- 4. Defendant conducts business in the State of California thereby establishing personal jurisdiction.
- 5. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2).

PARTIES

- 6. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Anaheim, Oakland County, California.
- 7. Defendant is a business entity with a principal place of business in Anaheim, California.
- 8. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- In or around 2015, Defendant began constantly and continuously places collection calls to Plaintiff seeking and demanding payment for an alleged debt.
- 10. Plaintiff's alleged debt arose through a consumer credit transaction.
- 11. Defendant places collection calls from telephone numbers, including, but not limited to, 858-333-8530 and 844-302-2274.
- 12. Defendant places collection calls to Plaintiff's cellular telephone at phone number 949-701-12XX.
- 13. Based upon the timing and frequency of Defendant's calls and per its prior business practices, each of Defendant's calls were placed using an automatic telephone dialing system.
- 14. In or around 2015, Defendant began placing multiple daily collection calls to Plaintiff.
- 15. On or around September 23, 2015 at approximately 10:39 a.m., Plaintiff spoke to

- Defendant's representative, "Amanda," and requested that Defendant cease placing collection calls.
- 16. Plaintiff revoked any consent, express, implied or otherwise, to receive automated collection calls from Defendant in the course of the telephone conversations on or around September 23, 2015.
- 17. Despite Plaintiff's repeated requests to cease, Defendant continued to place multiple collection calls to Plaintiff on a daily basis, including but not limited to at least one hundred eighty-seven (187) collection calls to Plaintiff 's cellular telephone over an approximate three-month period.

COUNT I

DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTIONS ACT

- 18. Defendant's actions alleged *supra* constitute numerous negligent violations of the TCPA, entitling Plaintiff to an award of \$500.00 in statutory damages for each and every violation pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B).
- 19. Defendant's actions alleged *supra* constitute numerous and multiple knowing and/or willful violates of the TCPA, entitling Plaintiff to an award of \$1500.00 in statutory damages for each and every violation pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) and 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(C).
 - Wherefore, Plaintiff, JONATHAN TANCINCO, respectfully requests judgment be entered against Defendant, CASHCALL, INC. for the following:
- 20. Statutory damages of \$500.00 for each and every negligent violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § (b)(3)(B);
- 21. Statutory damages of \$1500.00 for each and every knowing and/or willful violation of the TCPA pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § (b)(3)(b) and 47 U.S.C. § (b)(3)(C);
- 22. All court costs, witness fees and other fees incurred; and

3

5

9

10 11

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

2324

25

23. Any other relief that this Honorable Court deems appropriate.

COUNT II

DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE ROSENTHAL FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- 24. Plaintiff repeats and realleges all of the allegations in Count I of Plaintiff's Complaint as the allegations in Count II of Plaintiff's Complaint.
- 25. Defendant violated the RFDCPA based on the following:
 - a. Defendant violated § 1788.11(d) of the RFDCPA by causing a telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously to annoy the person called;
 - b. Defendant violated § 1788.11(e) of the RFDCPA by communicating with Plaintiff with such frequency as to be unreasonable and to constitute a harassment to Plaintiff.
 - c. Defendant violated § 1788.17 of the RFDCPA by failing to comply with the Fair Debt Collection Practices, Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692 *et seq.*, to wit:
 - 1. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA by engaging in conduct the natural consequence of which is to harass, oppress, or abuse Plaintiff;
 - 2. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA by causing a telephone to ring repeatedly or continuously with intent to annoy, harass, or abuse Plaintiff.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, JONATHAN TANCINCO, respectfully requests judgment be entered against Defendant, CASHCALL, INC. for the following:

- 26. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 pursuant to the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ. Code \$1788.30(b),
- 27. Costs and reasonable attorneys' fees pursuant to the Rosenthal Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, Cal. Civ Code § 1788.30(c), and

1	28. Any other relief that this Honorable Court deems appropriate.
2	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,
3	DATED: January 7, 2016 KROHN & MOSS, LTD.
4	
5	
6	By: /s/ <u>Ryan Lee</u> Ryan Lee Attorney for Plaintiff
7	
8	
9	DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL
10	PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, JONATHAN TANCINCO, demands a jury trial
11	in this case.
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
	II

PLAINTIFF'-SSCOMPLAINT

Case 8:16-cv-00021-CJC-KES Document 1 Filed 01/07/16 Page 5 of 5 Page ID #:5